arXiv:1301.1827v1 [math.DS] 9 Jan 2013

UPPER ESTIMATES FOR STABLE DIMENSIONS OF FRACTAL SETS WITH VARIABLE NUMBERS OF FOLDINGS

EUGEN MIHAILESCU AND BERND STRATMANN

Abstract. For a hyperbolic map f on a saddle type fractal Λ with self-intersections, the number of f-preimages of a point x in Λ may depend on x. This makes estimates of the stable dimensions more difficult than for diffeomorphisms or for maps which are constant-to-one. We employ the thermodynamic formalism in order to derive estimates for the stable Hausdorff dimension function δ^s on Λ, in the case when f is conformal on local stable manifolds. These estimates are in terms of a continuous function on Λ which bounds the preimage counting function from below. As a corollary we obtain that if δ^s attains its maximal possible value in Λ, then the stable dimension is constant throughout Λ, whereas the preimage counting function is constant on at least an open and dense subset of Λ. In particular, this shows that if at some point in Λ the stable dimension is equal to the analogue of the similarity dimension in the stable direction at that point, then f behaves very much like a homeomorphism on Λ. Finally, we also obtain results about the stable upper box dimension for these type of fractals. We end the paper with a discussion of two explicit examples.

Mathematics Subject Classification 2000: 37D35, 37F15 37D45, 37F10.

Keywords: Non-invertible hyperbolic maps; thermodynamic formalism; basic sets of saddle type; stable dimensions; conformal maps; fractals with overlap; Hausdorff dimension; box-counting dimension.

1. Introduction and statement of results.

In this paper we investigate fractal sets Λ of saddle type which are invariant under a non-invertible $\mathcal{C}^2$-endomorphism f of a Riemann manifold M into itself. These fractals are *basic sets of* f, meaning that Λ is compact and f-invariant such that $f|_\Lambda$ is topologically transitive and such that there exists a neighbourhood U of Λ satisfying $\Lambda = \bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f^n(U)$. The fact that f is non-invertible produces complicated overlaps and foldings within Λ, which influence the Hausdorff dimension of the sections through Λ and the number of overlaps does not necessarily has to be constant. We will always assume that f is hyperbolic on Λ in the sense of Ruelle [17], that is, for each backward orbit $\hat{x} = (x, x_{-1}, x_{-2}, \ldots)$ of x in Λ, where $f(x_{-1}) = x$ and $f(x_{-(i+1)}) = x_{-i} \in \Lambda$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a continuous splitting of the tangent bundle over the space $\hat{\Lambda}$ of all backward orbits of elements of Λ, called the *natural extension* (or inverse limit) of the tuple (Λ, f), into stable spaces E^s_x and unstable spaces $E^u_{\hat{x}}$. It is well-known that $\hat{\Lambda}$ is a compact metric space and that the lift $\hat{f} : \hat{\Lambda} \to \hat{\Lambda}$ of f to $\hat{\Lambda}$, given by $\hat{f}(\hat{x}) := (f(x), x, x_{-1}, x_{-2}, \ldots)$, is a homeomorphism. Note that natural extensions play an important role in the study of the dynamics of endomorphisms (see for instance [17, 11]). As in the diffeomorphism case, for a hyperbolic endomorphism f on Λ there exist local stable manifolds $W^s_r(x)$ and local unstable manifolds $W^u_r(\hat{x})$, for each $x \in \Lambda$ and $\hat{x} \in \hat{\Lambda}$. Note that there may be infinitely many local unstable manifolds through a given point in Λ and, unlike in the diffeomorphism case, these do not necessarily give rise to a foliation.

In this paper we will consider the *stable dimension at* $x \in \Lambda$, which is given by

$$\delta^s(x) := \dim_H(W^s_r(x) \cap \Lambda),$$

where $\dim_H$ refers to the Hausdorff dimension. To give estimates for the stable dimension is by far more delicate than for the unstable dimension $\delta^u(\hat{x}) := \dim_H(W^u_r(\hat{x}) \cap \Lambda)$. In fact, in [11] it was shown that $\delta^u(\hat{x})$ is constant on $\hat{\Lambda}$ and that its value is given by the unique zero of the pressure function $P_{\hat{f}|_{\hat{\Lambda}}}(-t \log |Df_u|)$, where $|Df_u(x)|$ denotes the norm of the derivative of f restricted to $E^u_{\hat{x}}$. However, for the stable dimension we can not expect that a similar formula holds in general.

Before we state our main result, let us point out that in this paper we consider a special type of hyperbolic endomorphisms which will be called *c-hyperbolic*. A map f is *c-hyperbolic* on Λ if it is hyperbolic as an endomorphism over Λ, if it is conformal on all local stable manifolds and if Λ does not contain any critical points of f.

Also, let us introduce the *preimage counting function* $\Delta : \Lambda \to \mathbb{N}$, which is given for each $x \in \Lambda$ by

$$\Delta(x) := \mathrm{Card}\left(f^{-1}(x) \cap \Lambda\right)$$

One immediately verifies that Δ is upper semi-continuous and bounded on Λ (see e.g. [12, Lemma 1]). Moreover, the *stable potential function* Φ^s on Λ is defined by $\Phi^s(x) := \log |Df_s(x)|$, where $|Df_s(x)|$ denotes the norm of the derivative of f restricted to E^s_x. We are now in the position to state the main result of this paper.

Theorem 1. *Let $f : M \to M$ be a $\mathcal{C}^2$-endomorphism which is c-hyperbolic on a basic set Λ of f and for which there exists a continuous function $\omega : \Lambda \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\Delta(x) \geq \omega(x)$, for all $x \in \Lambda$. It then follows that*

$$\delta^s(x) \leq t_\omega,$$

where t_ω refers to the unique zero of the pressure function $t \mapsto P(t\Phi^s - \log \omega)$ associated with the potential function $t\Phi^s - \log \omega$.

Let us point out that one of the difficulties in proving this theorem is that the map f is not necessarily expanding and that its inverse branches do not necessarily contract small balls. In fact, some directions may be even expanding in backward time. Another difficulty is that the number of preimages of a point that remain in Λ is not always constant.

The reader might like to recall that in their pioneering work Bowen [4] and Ruelle [19] employed the thermodynamic formalism in order to derive dimension formulae for rational maps. In fact, in the diffeomorphism case, it turned out that the stable and the unstable dimension can in general be computed both as the zero of the pressure function of the stable potential, respectively the unstable potential (see [8]); (for further applications of the thermodynamic formalism in dimension theory, we refer to [1], [14]). It is important to note that for an endomorphism f in higher dimension, a hyperbolic basic set is not necessarily totally invariant. This is of course significantly different from the case of Julia sets of rational maps in the complex one dimensional case. Examples of perturbations of toral endomorphisms which are Anosov and whose unstable manifolds depend on the whole prehistory were given in [15]. Another class of non-invertible hyperbolic maps with crossed invariant horseshoes was given by Bothe in [2]. Also, Simon [21] gave another class of non-invertible endomorphisms, for which the Hausdorff dimension of the associated attractors can be computed with the help of a pressure formula just as in the invertible case. Examples of non-linear hyperbolic skew products of Cantor sets with overlaps in their fibres were given in [10], where the strongly non-invertible character of these maps has been established, and where it was shown that these skew products are far away from being constant-to-one. In [10] it was also shown that there are maps for which there exist Cantor sets in each of their fibres, such that through each point of these sets there pass uncountably many

different local unstable manifolds. Also let us mention that yet another class of c-hyperbolic endomorphisms can be found by considering hyperbolic basic sets of saddle type, for holomorphic maps $f : \mathbb{P}^2\mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{P}^2\mathbb{C}$ on the 2-dimensional complex projective space ([11]).

The paper continues by showing that an application of Theorem 1 gives rise to the following proposition. In here, we consider the situation in which δ^s attains a maximal value and show that in this case, δ^s has to be constant throughout Λ and that Δ has to be equal to its least value d on an open dense subset.

Proposition 1. *If in addition to the assumptions in Theorem 1 we have that the minimal value of Δ on Λ is equal to d and that there exists a point $x \in \Lambda$ at which δ^s is equal to the unique zero t_d of the pressure function $t \mapsto P(t\Phi^s - \log d)$, then Δ is equal to d on an open dense subset of Λ and $\delta^s(y)$ is equal to t_d, for all $y \in \Lambda$.*

Note that the latter proposition can be applied in particular in the case in which d is equal to 1 and where there is no overlap. In this situation the stable dimension is equal to the similarity dimension, and the proposition then guarantees that there exists an open dense set of points in Λ at which f has precisely one preimage in Λ. Therefore, in this case the map behaves almost like a homeomorphism when restricted to Λ. This particular situation is somewhat parallel to a result of Schief [20], although the setting and proofs are completely different. We summarise these results in the following corollary.

Corollary 1. *Let $f : M \to M$ be a $\mathcal{C}^2$-endomorphism which is c-hyperbolic on a basic set Λ of f and for which there exists a point $x \in \Lambda$ such that $\delta^s(x)$ is equal to the unique zero t_1 of the pressure function $t \mapsto P(t\Phi^s)$. Then there exists an open dense set of points in Λ at which f has precisely one preimage in Λ. Moreover, we have that $\delta^s(y) = t_1$, for all $y \in \Lambda$.*

Also, in **Corollary 3** from Section 4 we will show how our Corollary 1 can be applied to a class of translations of horseshoes with overlaps, previously studied by Simon and Solomyak in [22].

Let us now remark that a combination of Theorem 1 with the main theorem in [12] gives rise to the following result.

Corollary 2. *If in addition to the assumptions in Theorem 1 we have that the preimage counting function Δ is locally constant on Λ, then it follows that $\delta^s(x) = t_\omega$, for all $x \in \Lambda$. Here, t_ω is given as in Theorem 1.*

Finally, we consider the *stable upper box dimension* $\beta^s(x)$ which is given by the upper box-counting dimension $\overline{\dim}_B(W^s_r(x) \cap \Lambda)$ of the set $W^s_r(x) \cap \Lambda$, for each $x \in \Lambda$. (For a general discussion of the upper box dimension for fractal sets we refer to [9] and [14]). We show that this dimension function is constant throughout Λ and that in the situation in which Δ is bounded from below, similarly as in Theorem 1, one derives an upper bound for its value. These results are summarised in the following proposition.

Proposition 2. *Let $f : M \to M$ be a $\mathcal{C}^2$-endomorphism which is c-hyperbolic on a basic set Λ of f. Then the following hold.*

(a) *If there exists a continuous function $\omega : \Lambda \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\Delta(x) \geq \omega(x)$, for all $x \in \Lambda$, then we have, with t_ω given as in Theorem 1,*

$$\beta^s(y) \leq t_\omega, \text{ for all } y \in \Lambda.$$

(b) *The function β^s is constant on Λ.*

In particular the above results apply for hyperbolic basic sets of saddle type for holomorphic maps $f : \mathbb{P}^2\mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{P}^2\mathbb{C}$. We will end the paper by giving two further explicit examples in which the above results can be applied. Our first example will be concerned with certain horseshoes with overlaps in $\mathbb{R}^3$ considered in [22]. The second example will be on basic sets for a family of hyperbolic skew products studied in [10].

We close this introduction with some comments on how the results in this paper relate to previous work in this area.

In [6] (see also [23] and [13]) Falconer studied self-affine fractals with overlaps obtained from finitely many linear contractions $T_i(x) = \lambda_i x, i = 1, ..., \ell$ in $\mathbb{R}$ satisfying $0 < |\lambda_i| < 1$ and $\sum_{1\leq i\leq \ell} |\lambda_i| < 1$. He showed that the Hausdorff dimension of the invariant set of the family of translated contractions $\{T_i + a_i, : 1 \leq i \leq \ell\}$ is equal to s, for Lebesgue almost all $(a_1, \ldots, a_\ell) \in \mathbb{R} \times ... \times \mathbb{R}$; where s represents the *similarity dimension*, defined as the solution of the equation

$$\sum_{1\leq i\leq \ell} |\lambda_i|^s = 1$$

We remark that this result may be extended also to similarities on $\mathbb{R}^n$. However, the result fails if the condition $\sum_{1\leq i\leq \ell} |\lambda_i| < 1$ is not satisfied, as observed by Edgar ([5]), who based his argument on a result by Przytycki and Urbański ([16]). Indeed, if $T_1 = T_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1/2 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}$ and if $|\lambda| > \frac{1}{2}$, then for Lebesgue almost every $a = (a_1, a_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ the attractor $\Lambda(a)$ of the system $\{T_1 + a_1, T_2 + a_2\}$ stays to be the same; and moreover if $1/\lambda$ is a Pisot number (that is, an algebraic integer such that the absolute value of all its algebraic conjugates is less than 1), then $\dim_H(\Lambda(a)) < 2 - (\log(1/\lambda))/\log 2$ (see e.g. [23]). This shows that fractals originating from overlapping constructions can have Hausdorff dimension *less* than their similarity dimension.

In [20] Schief considered self-similar fractal sets K and showed that if for the similarity dimension σ of K one has that the σ-dimensional Hausdorff measure $\mathcal{H}^\sigma(K)$ is positive, then K satisfies the strong open set condition, that is, the system behaves similar to a homeomorphism on K. Note that this result is in the spirit of our results in this paper, although the setting and the ideas of our proofs differ significantly from the approach in [20]. More precisely, the assumptions in Proposition 1 are much weaker than the ones in [20]. Namely, in order to obtain the "almost injectivity" of the system associated with Λ, we only require that the stable dimension $\delta^s(x)$ is equal to the zero t_1 of the pressure function $t \to P(t\Phi^s)$, for some $x \in \Lambda$; we do not require that $\mathcal{H}^{t_1}(W^s_r(x) \cap \Lambda) > 0$. In our case t_1 is the analogue of the similarity dimension in the stable direction, in the sense that it represents the dimension which one would obtain if the system would be invertible. In particular if there exists some $x \in \Lambda$ for which $\mathcal{H}^{t_1}(W^s_r(x) \cap \Lambda) > 0$ is positive, then we have that the stable dimension is everywhere equal to t_1 and that there exists an open dense set of points in Λ which have precisely one preimage in Λ.

Finally, in [12] Mihailescu and Urbanski studied c-hyperbolic maps on Λ for which Δ is bounded from *above* by a continuous map η on Λ. In that paper the authors obtain the result that $\delta^s(x) \geq t_\eta$ for all $x \in \Lambda$, where t_η refers to the unique zero of the pressure function $t \to P(t\Phi^s - \log \eta)$. Note that the proof for the upper estimate in this paper is very different from the proof for the lower estimates in [12]. However, we can combine these two estimates, as done in Corollary 2, to obtain that if the preimage counting function Δ is locally constant on Λ, then the stable dimension is equal to t_Δ throughout Λ.

2. Proof of Theorem 1.

For ease of exposition, let us first consider the situation in which ω is locally constant and takes on only two different positive integer values on Λ, namely d_1 on the set V_1 and d_2 on the set V_2. We then have that $V_1 \cup V_2 = \Lambda$ and that V_1 and V_2 are two disjoint compact subsets of Λ. Hence, there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that the distance $d(V_1, V_2)$ between V_1 and V_2 is greater than ε_0. For $x \in \Lambda$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $B_n(x, \varepsilon) := \{y \in \Lambda : d(f^i(y), f^i(x)) < \varepsilon, 0 \leq i \leq n-1\}$ refer to the n-Bowen ball centred at x of radius $\varepsilon > 0$. Note that for $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ we have that if $y \in B_n(x, \varepsilon)$ then $f^i(y)$ and $f^i(x)$ both belong to either

V_1 or V_2, for each $0 \leq i \leq n-1$. Recall that $\Phi^s(x) := \log |Df_s(x)|, x \in \Lambda$. Now, let $t > t_\omega$ be fixed. By definition of t_ω, we have that there exists $\beta > 0$ such that

$$P(t\Phi^s - \log \omega) < -\beta$$

Hence, by choosing $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough, there exists a minimal (n, ε)-spanning set E_n for Λ such that

$$\sum_{z \in E_n} (\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t \cdot \frac{1}{\Delta(f(z) \cdot \ldots \cdot \Delta(f^n(z))} < C\, e^{-\beta n} < 1, \tag{1}$$

where we have set $U_n(z) := f^n(B_n(z, \varepsilon)) \cap W_r^s(x) \cap \Lambda$. Note that in here we have used the fact that the set $U_n(z)$ is the intersection of an unstable tubular neighbourhood with the fixed stable manifold $W_r^s(x)$. Also, we used that $|Df_s^n(z)|$ is uniformly comparable to diam $U_n(z)$, which follows from the fact that f is conformal on local stable manifolds.

In the sequel let us put $W := W_r^s(x) \cap \Lambda$. Hence, the aim is to show that $\dim_H(W) \leq t$, for each $t > t_\omega$. The main idea of the proof is to extract suitable covers of W out of the large set of covers which are given by taking n-preimages, such that at each step a different sum will be minimised. Note that we say that a point y is a *k-preimage of x* if $f^k(y) = x$. Each such n-preimage will be included in a Bowen ball of type $B_n(z, \varepsilon)$, for some $z \in E_n$. This procedure is delicate, since at each step the number of preimages of points belonging to Λ varies. The idea is to consider the k iterates of n-preimages, then to subdivide Λ into various different parts and finally, to find suitable covers of these parts which minimise certain sums at the k-th level.

First, note that since Λ is covered by the set of Bowen balls $\{B_n(z, \varepsilon) : z \in E_n\}$, it follows that $\{U_n(z) : z \in E_n\}$ covers W. However, this cover is far too rich and we will have to extract a suitable subcover. Indeed, by using a well known theorem by Besicovitch (see for e.g. [9]), there exists a subcover $\{5U_n(z) : z \in \mathcal{G}(0)\}$ of W such that $\{U_n(z) : z \in \mathcal{G}(0)\}$ consists of pairwise disjoint sets. (Note that, since f is conformal on local stable manifolds, we can assume that the sets $U_n(z)$ are in fact balls, and we denote the radii of these by $r(n, z)$; also, we write $5U_n(z)$ to denote the ball of radius $5r(n, z)$ centred at the centre of $U_n(z)$). The next step is to "inflate" this cover, that is, to enlarge it to a "richer" cover of W. For this, we consider an $(n-1)$-preimage of w in Λ which we denote by $w(n-1)$, for each point $w \in W$. Let us assume that $w(n-1) \in V_1$ and hence, that $w(n-1)$ has at least d_1 1-preimages in Λ. Now, since E_n is (n, ε)-spanning, for each point $\xi \in \Lambda$, there exists at least one point $y \in E_n$ such that $\xi \in B_n(y, \varepsilon)$. However, we cannot have two 1-preimages of some $w(n-1)$ belonging to different Bowen balls $B_n(y, \varepsilon)$ and $B_n(y', \varepsilon)$ such that y and y' are both in $\mathcal{G}(0)$. This is an immediate consequence of the fact that $\{U_n(z) : z \in \mathcal{G}(0)\}$ consists of pairwise disjoint sets.

Therefore, by way of successive eliminations, we can find d_1 pairwise disjoint families, denoted by $\mathcal{F}(1, d_1; 1), \ldots, \mathcal{F}(1, d_1; d_1)$, such that $\{5U_n(z) : z \in \mathcal{F}(1, d_2; i)\}$ is a cover of the set $\{w \in W : w(n-1) \in V_1\}$, for each $1 \leq i \leq d_1$. Obviously, for $w(n-1) \in V_2$ we can proceed in a similar way, which then gives rise to d_2 mutually disjoint families $\mathcal{F}(1, d_2; 1), \ldots, \mathcal{F}(1, d_2; d_2)$ for which we have that $\{5U_n(z) : z \in \mathcal{F}(1, d_2; j)\}$ is a cover of $\{w \in W : w(n-1) \in V_2\}$, for each $1 \leq j \leq d_2$. Note that, since $d(V_1, V_2) > 0$, we have that $\mathcal{F}(1, d_1; i) \cap \mathcal{F}(1, d_2; j) = \emptyset$, for all i and j, and that by construction we have that the so obtained disjoint families are all contained in E_n. Next, define

$$\mathcal{F}(1) := \bigcup_{i=1}^{2} \bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq d_i} \mathcal{F}(1, d_i, j)$$

and let $\mathcal{G}(1, d_k)$ be given, for $k \in \{1, 2\}$, by

$$\sum_{z \in \mathcal{G}(1, d_k)} \frac{(\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t}{\Delta(f^2(z)) \ldots \Delta(f^n(z))} = \min \left\{ \sum_{z \in \mathcal{F}(1, d_k; i)} \frac{(\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t}{\Delta(f^2(z)) \ldots \Delta(f^n(z))} : i \in \{1, ..., d_k\} \right\}.$$

For $\mathcal{G}(1) := \mathcal{G}(1,d_1) \cup \mathcal{G}(1,d_2)$, we then obtain, by adding the sums over $\mathcal{G}(1,d_1)$ and $\mathcal{G}(1,d_2)$,

$$\sum_{z\in\mathcal{G}(1)} \frac{(\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t}{\Delta(f^2(z))\dots\Delta(f^n(z))} \leq \sum_{z\in\mathcal{F}(1)} \frac{(\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t}{\Delta(f(z))\dots\Delta(f^n(z))}. \tag{2}$$

Note that here we have used the trivial fact that for each $x \in \Lambda$ we have that $\sum_{y\in\Lambda, f(y)=x} 1/\Delta(x) = 1$. Also, note that the sum over the family $\mathcal{G}(1)$ on the left hand side of the inequality in (2) is smaller than the sum over the larger family $\mathcal{F}(1)$ on the right hand side. However, and this is the crucial point, the summands on the right hand side have one more factor in their denominator than the summands on the left hand side.

Let us now bring the argument to its next level by enlarging the family $\mathcal{F}(1)$ as follows. Recall that for each $w \in W$ we have fixed an $(n-1)$-preimage $w(n-1) \in \Lambda$. We now define $w(n-2) := f(w(n-1))$ and consider not only $w(n-1)$ but also the other 1-preimages of $w(n-2)$ in Λ. Subsequently, we will then take the 1-preimages of these 1-preimages of $w(n-2)$ and obtain new covers of W. Indeed similarly as before, if $w(n-2) \in V_1$ then we can construct, by succesive eliminations, pairwise disjoint families $\mathcal{F}(2,d_1;1),...,\mathcal{F}(2,d_1;d_1)$ by selecting the 1-preimages of the i-th preimage of $w(n-2)$, for each $1 \leq i \leq d_1$. In fact one of these families is $\mathcal{F}(1)$. As in the first step, the sets $\{5U_n(z) : z \in \mathcal{F}(2,d_1;i)\}$ cover $\{w \in W : w(n-2) \in V_1\}$, for each i. Let us remark that the procedure of successive elimination works, since if we take for instance the family $\mathcal{F}(2,d_1;1)$, then for an arbitrary $w \in W$ we cannot have two 1-preimages y and y' of $w(n-2)$ and 1-preimages ξ of y and ξ' of y' such that ξ and ξ' are both contained in either $B_n(z,\varepsilon)$ or $B_n(z',\varepsilon)$, for some $z, z' \in \mathcal{F}(2,d_1;1)$. Indeed, since $f^2(B_n(z,\varepsilon)) \cap f^2(B_n(z',\varepsilon)) \neq \emptyset$, in this situation it would follow that $U_n(z) \cap U_n(z') \neq \emptyset$ and hence we would have a contradiction. This implies that there exist d_1 disjoint families $\mathcal{F}(2,d_1;i)$ corresponding to the d_1 1-preimages of $w(n-2) \in V_1$.

Clearly, we can proceed analogously in the case in which $w(n-2) \in V_2$, which then gives rise to pairwise disjoint families $\mathcal{F}(2,d_2;1),...,\mathcal{F}(2,d_2;d_2)$ for which $\{5U_n(z) : z \in \mathcal{F}(2,d_2;j)\}$ covers $\{w \in W : w(n-2) \in V_2\}$, for each j. Note that we cannot have repetitions of points from E_n when taking the union of the collections $\mathcal{F}(2,d_i;j)$ over all $i \in \{1,2\}$ and $1 \leq j \leq d_i$. Indeed, if we would have two 1-preimages $y, y' \in \Lambda$ of some $w(n-2)$ and two 1-preimages $\xi, \xi' \in \Lambda$ of y, and y' respectively, so that $\xi \in B_n(z,\varepsilon)$ and $\xi' \in B_n(z',\varepsilon)$, for some $z, z' \in \mathcal{F}(2,d_1;i)$, then it would follow that $U_n(z) \cap U_n(z') \neq \emptyset$, which gives a contradiction. Moreover, by construction we have that $\mathcal{F}(2,d_1;i) \cap \mathcal{F}(2,d_2;j) = \emptyset$, for all i and j. This follows, since if $f^2(z) \in V_1$, for some $z \in \mathcal{F}(2,d_1;i)$, and if at the same time $f^2(z') \in V_2$, for some $z' \in \mathcal{F}(2,d_2;j)$, then it would follow that $V_1 \cap V_2 \neq \emptyset$ and hence, we would get a contradiction.

Now, as in the first step, for each $i \in \{1,2\}$ and $1 \leq j \leq d_i$ there exists a family $\mathcal{G}(2,d_i,j)$ in $\{\mathcal{F}(2,d_k;\ell) : k \in \{1,2\}, 1 \leq \ell \leq d_j\}$ satisfying

$$\sum_{z\in\mathcal{G}(2,d_i,j)} \frac{(\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t}{\Delta(f^2(z))\dots\Delta(f^n(z))} \leq \sum_{z\in\mathcal{F}(2,d_i;j)} \frac{(\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t}{\Delta(f(z))\Delta(f^2(z))\dots\Delta(f^n(z))}. \tag{3}$$

Among these so obtained families $\mathcal{G}(2,d_i;j)$ we now choose for each $i \in \{1,2\}$ a particular family, which will be denoted by $\mathcal{G}(2,d_i)$, such that

$$\sum_{z\in\mathcal{G}(2,d_i)} \frac{(\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t}{\Delta(f^3(z))\dots\Delta(f^n(z))} = \min\left\{ \sum_{z\in\mathcal{G}(2,d_i;j)} \frac{(\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t}{\Delta(f^3(z))\dots\Delta(f^n(z))} : j \in \{1,...,d_i\} \right\}. \tag{4}$$

Combining (3) and (4), we now have for each $i \in \{1,2\}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{z\in\mathcal{G}(2,d_i)} \frac{(\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t}{\Delta(f^3(z))\dots\Delta(f^n(z))} &\leq \sum_{z\in\bigcup_{1\leq j\leq d_i}\mathcal{G}(2,d_i;j)} \frac{(\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t}{\Delta(f^2(z))\dots\Delta(f^n(z))} \\ &\leq \sum_{z\in\bigcup_{1\leq j\leq d_i}\mathcal{F}(2,d_i;j)} \frac{(\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t}{\Delta(f(z))\Delta(f^2(z))\dots\Delta(f^n(z))}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by defining

$$\mathcal{F}(2) := \bigcup_{i\in\{1,2\}} \bigcup_{1\le j\le d_i} \mathcal{F}(2,d_i;j) \text{ and } \mathcal{G}(2) := \mathcal{G}(2,d_1)\cup\mathcal{G}(2,d_2),$$

we have now shown that

$$\sum_{z\in\mathcal{G}(2)} \frac{(\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t}{\Delta(f^3(z))\dots\Delta(f^n(z))} \le \sum_{z\in\mathcal{F}(2)} \frac{(\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t}{\Delta(f(z))\dots\Delta(f^n(z))}. \tag{5}$$

Continuing the above procedure assume we have constructed a family $\mathcal{F}(k)\subset E_n$ and a subfamily $\mathcal{G}(k)$, so that the sets $(U_n(z))_{z\in\mathcal{G}(k)}$ 5-cover W and

$$\sum_{z\in\mathcal{G}(k)} \frac{(\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t}{\Delta(f^{k+1}(z))\dots\Delta(f^n(z))} \le \sum_{z\in\mathcal{F}(k)} \frac{(\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t}{\Delta(f(z))\dots\Delta(f^n(z))}.$$

For each $w\in W$, we then take the k-th iterate of $w(n-1)$ and denote it by $w(n-k-1)$; this is an $(n-k-1)$-preimage of w in Λ. Now, if $w(n-k-1)\in V_1$ then it has d_1 1-preimages in Λ and to each of these we can apply the same procedure from step k. In this way we obtain by succesive eliminations d_1 mutually disjoint families $\mathcal{F}(k+1,d_1;i), 1\le i\le d_1$ and inside each of these a subfamily $\mathcal{G}(k+1,d_1;i)$ such that

$$\sum_{z\in\mathcal{G}(k+1,d_1;i)} \frac{(\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t}{\Delta(f^{k+1}(z))\dots\Delta(f^n(z))} \le \sum_{z\in\mathcal{F}(k+1,d_1;i)} \frac{(\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t}{\Delta(f(z))\dots\Delta(f^n(z))}.$$

The succesive elimination procedure works, since we cannot have two differerent 1-preimages y and y' of $w(n-k-1)$ having $(n-k)$-preimages $\xi\in\Lambda$ and $\xi'\in\Lambda$ respectively, such that $\xi\in B_n(z,\varepsilon), \xi'\in B_n(z',\varepsilon)$, for some $z,z'\in\mathcal{F}(k+1,d_1;i)$. Indeed, it would then follow that the family $\{U_n(z): z\in\mathcal{F}(k+1,d_1;i)\}$ does not consist of pairwise disjoint sets, which clearly is a contradiction. Moreover, since $V_1\cap V_2=\emptyset$, we must have $\mathcal{F}(k+1,d_1;i)\cap\mathcal{F}(k+1,d_2;j)=\emptyset$. Hence, there is no repetition of elements, when we consider the union

$$\mathcal{F}(k+1) := \bigcup_{1\le j\le d_1} \mathcal{F}(k+1,d_1;j) \cup \bigcup_{1\le j\le d_2} \mathcal{F}(k+1,d_2;j).$$

Now among the collections $\mathcal{G}(k+1,d_1;i)$, for $1\le i\le d_1$, let us consider the one which gives rise to the least sum $\sum_{z\in\mathcal{G}(k+1,d_1;i)} \frac{(\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t}{\Delta(f^{k+2}(z))\dots\Delta(f^n(z))}$. Denote this minimizing collection by $\mathcal{G}(k+1,d_1)$. Similarly, we obtain the collection $\mathcal{G}(k+1,d_2)$. We now have that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{z\in\mathcal{G}(k+1,d_1)} \frac{(\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t}{\Delta(f^{k+2}(z))\dots\Delta(f^n(z))} &\le \sum_{z\in \bigcup_{1\le i\le d_1}\mathcal{G}(k+1,d_1;i)} \frac{(\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t}{\Delta(f^{k+1}(z))\dots\Delta(f^n(z))} \\ &\le \sum_{z\in \bigcup_{1\le i\le d_1}\mathcal{F}(k+1,d_1;i)} \frac{(\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t}{\Delta(f(z))\dots\Delta(f^n(z))}.\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Of course, we can proceed similarly for $\mathcal{G}(k+1,d_2)$. With $\mathcal{G}(k+1):=\mathcal{G}(k+1,d_1)\cup\mathcal{G}(k+1,d_2)$., it follows from above that

$$\sum_{z\in\mathcal{G}(k+1)} \frac{(\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t}{\Delta(f^{k+2}(z))\dots\Delta(f^n(z))} \le \sum_{z\in \bigcup_{1\le i\le d_1}\mathcal{F}(k+1)} \frac{(\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t}{\Delta(f(z))\dots\Delta(f^n(z))}.$$

Therefore, we obtain by finite induction a union $\mathcal{F}(n)$ of families in E_n, as well as one particular family $\mathcal{G}(n)$ such that $\{5U_n(z): z\in\mathcal{G}(n)\}$ covers the set W and has the property that

$$\sum_{z\in\mathcal{G}(n)} (\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t \le \sum_{z\in\mathcal{F}(n)} \frac{(\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t}{\Delta(f(z))\dots\Delta(f^n(z))}.$$

By combining this with the observation in (1) at the start of the proof, this shows that

$$\sum_{z\in\mathcal{G}(n)} (\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t < 1.$$

Since $\{5U_n(z) : z \in \mathcal{G}(n)\}$ is a covering of the set $W = W^s_r(x) \cap \Lambda$, we can now conclude that

$$\delta^s(x) \leq t < t_\omega.$$

In the more general case in which ω is a continuous function on Λ with the property that $\omega(x) \leq \Delta(x)$, for all $x \in \Lambda$, we proceed as follows. First note that, by continuity of ω, we have that there exists an increasing, positive function ρ on Λ such that $\rho(\varepsilon)$ decreases to zero for ε tending to zero from above, and such that if $d(y, z) \leq \varepsilon$, then

$$|\omega(y) - \omega(z)| \leq \rho(\varepsilon)$$

Since if $y \in B_n(z, \varepsilon)$ then $f^i(y) \in B(f^i z, \varepsilon)$, the latter implies that if $y \in B_n(z, \varepsilon)$ then $|\omega(f^i(y))-\omega(f^i(z))| \leq \rho(\varepsilon)$. Hence, since $\Delta(x) \geq \omega(x)$ for all $x \in \Lambda$, it follows that for each $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ we have

$$\Delta(f^i(y)) \geq \omega(f^i(y)) \geq \omega(f^i(z)) - \rho(\varepsilon).$$

Now in order to proceed, let us define the ε-pressure function P_ε, for some arbitrary potential function ψ, by

$$P_\varepsilon(\psi) := \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \inf \left\{ \sum_{x\in E} \exp\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \psi(f^k(x)) \right) : E \text{ is a } (n,\varepsilon)\text{-spanning set for } \Lambda \right\}$$

and let t_ε denote the unique zero of $P_\varepsilon(t\Phi^s - \log(\omega - \rho(\varepsilon)))$. Then let $t > t_\varepsilon$ be fixed and note that the above proof goes through in the same way if in the sums appearing there, we replace the function Δ by the function $\omega - \rho(\varepsilon)$. Indeed, this follows since for all $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ we have that $\Delta(f^i y) \geq \omega(f^i(y)) \geq \omega(f^i(z)) - \rho(\varepsilon)$, for each $y \in B_n(z, \varepsilon)$ and for some arbitrary fixed element z contained in some minimal (n, ε)-spanning set E_n for Λ. In this way, the above inductive procedure gives rise to a family $\mathcal{F}(n) \subset E_n$ and to a particular family $\mathcal{G}(n)$ such that $\{5U_n(z) : z \in \mathcal{G}(n)\}$ covers the set W and such that

$$\sum_{z\in\mathcal{G}(n)} (\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t \leq \sum_{z\in\mathcal{F}(n)} \frac{(\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t}{(\omega(f(z)) - \rho(\varepsilon)) \dots (\omega(f^n(z)) - \rho(\varepsilon))} < 1.$$

Now, for $\eta > 0$ sufficiently small and $0 < \varepsilon < \eta$, let $\tau_{\varepsilon,\eta}$ refer to the unique zero of the pressure function $P_\varepsilon(t\Phi^s - \log(\omega - \rho(\eta)))$ and let τ_η denote the unique zero of the pressure function $P(t\Phi^s - \log(\omega - \rho(\eta)))$. Since $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} P_\varepsilon(\psi) = P(\psi)$ for each continuous function ψ, it follows that $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \tau_{\varepsilon,\eta} = \tau_\eta$. On the other hand, note that for $0 < \varepsilon < \eta$ we have that $\rho(\varepsilon) < \rho(\eta)$ and therefore, $t\Phi^s - \log(\omega - \rho(\varepsilon)) \leq t\Phi^s - \log(\omega - \rho(\eta))$. This implies that $\tau_\varepsilon \leq \tau_{\varepsilon,\eta}$. Now, consider some arbitrary fixed $t > \tau_\eta$. For $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, we then have that $t > \tau_{\varepsilon,\eta} \geq \tau_\varepsilon$. Hence, from the above we have that for t in this range and for n sufficiently large, there exists a cover $\{5U_n(z) : z \in \mathcal{G}(n)\}$ of W such that

$$\sum_{z\in\mathcal{G}(n)} (\operatorname{diam} U_n(z))^t < 1.$$

This shows that $t \geq \dim_H(W)$ and therefore, since $t > \tau_\eta$ was chosen to be arbitrary, it follows that $\tau_\eta \geq \dim_H(W)$. Finally, observe that the continuity of the pressure function implies that $\lim_{\eta\to 0} \tau_\eta = t_\omega$, and this then allows to deduce the desired inequality

$$\dim_H(W) \leq t_\omega.$$

□

3. Proofs of Proposition 1 and Proposition 2.

Proof of Proposition 1.

Recall that here we assume that d is the minimal value of Δ on Λ. Then note that, since Δ is upper semi-continuous on Λ and takes on only integer values, it follows that if $\Delta(x) = d$ for some $x \in \Lambda$, then we have that the preimage counting function Δ must be equal to d on some open neighbourhood of x. This implies that the set

$$A := \{x \in \Lambda : \Delta(x) = d\}$$

has to be open in Λ. In order to show that A is dense in Λ, assume to the contrary that there exists a non-empty open set $V \subset \Lambda$ such that $\Delta(x) \geq d + 1$, for all $x \in V$. In this situation we can then find a Lipschitz continuous function ψ on Λ such that $d \leq \psi(x) \leq \Delta(x)$, for all $x \in \Lambda$, and such that $\psi \equiv d + 1$ on some open ball contained in V.

Now note that Theorem 1 implies that $t_\psi \geq \delta^s(x)$, for all $x \in \Lambda$. Also, since $\psi(x) \geq d$ for all $x \in \Lambda$, we have that $t_\psi \leq t_d$. Therefore, if for some $x \in \Lambda$ we have that $t_d = \delta^s(x)$, then it follows that

$$t_d = t_\psi = \delta^s(x).$$

Let us now consider the unique equilibrium measure μ_ψ for the Hölder continuous potential $t_d\Phi^s - \log\psi$ (note that existence and uniqueness of μ_ψ is guaranteed, since f is hyperbolic on Λ (see [7] and [11])). Also, since μ_ψ is a f-invariant probability measure for which the Variational Principle holds for the potential $t_d\Phi^s - \log d$, we have that

$$0 = P(t_d\Phi^s - \log d) = P(t_d\Phi^s - \log\psi) = h_{\mu_\psi} + \int_\Lambda (t_d\Phi^s - \log\psi)\ \mathrm{d}\mu_\psi \geq h_{\mu_\psi} + \int_\Lambda (t_d\Phi^s - \log d)\ \mathrm{d}\mu_\psi.$$

This shows that

$$\int_\Lambda \log\psi\ \mathrm{d}\mu_\psi \leq \int_\Lambda \log d\ \mathrm{d}\mu_\psi.$$

However, recall that $\log\psi(y) > \log d$, for all y in some open ball contained in V. Moreover, since μ_ψ is an equilibrium measure, we have that μ_ψ is positive on Bowen balls and hence, it is positive on any open set in Λ. Clearly, this gives a contradiction and therefore, it follows that $\Delta \equiv d$ on a dense open set in Λ.

In order to show that if $\Delta \equiv d$ on an open dense set then it follows that $\delta^s(y) = t_d$ for all $y \in \Lambda$, we define the set

$$A_n := \{x \in \Lambda : x \text{ has precisely } d^n \text{ } n\text{-preimages } y_i \text{ and } \Delta(f^j(y_i)) = d, \text{ for all } 0 \leq j \leq n \text{ and } 1 \leq i \leq d^n\}.$$

The aim is to show that A_n is open and dense in Λ, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For this, we first show that A_1 is open in Λ. By definition, we have that if $x \in A_1$ then $x \in A$ and hence, x has precisely d 1-preimages $x_1, \ldots, x_d \in A$. Now, let y be a point close to x. Since A is open, we can assume without loss of generality that $y \in A$ and hence, y has precisely d preimages $y_1, ..., y_d \in \Lambda$. Since d is the least value Δ can attain on Λ and since f has no critical points in Λ, we have that each of the y_i is close to one of the x_j. Since A is open and since the x_j are contained in A, it follows that $y_i \in A$, for all $1 \leq i \leq d$ provided y is close enough to x. This shows that $y \in A_1$ and hence it follows that A_1 is open in Λ.

In order to show that A_1 is dense in Λ, consider some open set V in Λ. Since A is dense in Λ, there exists some point $y \in A \cap V$, which must have precisely d 1-preimages $y_1, \ldots, y_d \in \Lambda$. Now, let $B \subset A$ be a small ball centred at y. For each $1 \leq i \leq d$, choose a sufficiently small ball B_i centred at y_i such that the resulting family of balls is pairwise disjoint and such that f is injective on B_i and on $B \subset f(B_i)$. The aim is to show that $B \cap f(B_i \cap A)$ is open and dense in B. Indeed, if $z \in B \cap f(B_i \cap A)$, then z has a 1-preimage $z_i \in B_i \cap A$. Now, if z' is close enough to z, then z' belongs to A and hence, z' has a 1-preimage $z_i' \in B_i$ which lies close to z_i. Since $z_i \in A$ and since A is open, it follows that $z_i' \in A$. This gives that $B \cap f(B_i \cap A)$ is open in B. Also, if there were a non-empty open set $B' \subset B$ such that $B' \cap f(B_i \cap A) = \emptyset$, then $B_i \cap f^{-1}(B')$ would be

open and non-empty. Clearly, this contradicts the fact that A dense in Λ. This shows that $B \cap f(B_i \cap A)$ must be open and dense in B, for all $1 \leq i \leq d$. Since a finite intersection of open and dense subsets is again open and dense, it now follows that A_1 has to be open and dense in Λ.

Clearly, the same methods as in the previous argument can be used to prove by way of induction that A_n is open and dense in Λ, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, we now have that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an open dense set A_n such that for every $y \in A_n$ there exist exactly d^n n-preimages $y_1, ..., y_{d^n} \in \Lambda$ of y such that $\Delta(f^i y_j) = d$, for each $0 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq d^n$. This shows that in the proofs of Theorem 1 and the main theorem of [12] one can work exclusively with points from $\bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} A_n$. Indeed since A_n is open and dense in Λ, it follows that for every $z \in E_n$ we can take a point z' sufficiently close to z such that $f^n(z') \in A_n$; thus we obtain a set E'_n with the same number of elements as E_n which is again (n, ε)-spanning and can be used in the condition on the pressure in order to obtain good covers of $W^s_r(x) \cap \Lambda$. Then all the iterates up to order n of any $z' \in E'_n$ will have exactly d 1-preimages in Λ and then we obtain $\delta^s(x) = t_d$, for all $x \in \Lambda$.

□

Proof of Proposition 2.

(a) In the sequel let $x \in \Lambda$ be fixed and put $W := W^s_r(x) \cap \Lambda$. As in the proof of Theorem 1, for each $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ and a minimal (n_0, ε)-spanning set E_{n_0} for Λ such that for each $t > t_\omega$ sufficiently large we have, for some fixed $\beta > 0$,

$$\sum_{z\in E_{n_0}} \frac{|Df^{n_0}_s(z)|^t}{\omega(f(z)\dots\omega(f^{n_0}z)} < e^{-\beta n_0} < 1/2. \tag{7}$$

Let us assume $E_{n_0} =: \{e_1, \dots, e_{m_0}\}$. As before, define $U_n(z) := f^n(B_n(z, \varepsilon)) \cap W^s_r(x)$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $z \in \Lambda$. The aim is to construct a covering of W which consists of sets of comparable diameter. For this, let $\{|Df^{n_0}_s(z)| : z \in E_{n_0}\} =: \{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{m_0}\}$ and then define for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the value $\chi(n)$ by

$$\chi(n) := \inf\left\{\prod_{i=1}^{n} \delta_{j_i} : 1 \leq j_i \leq m_0\right\}.$$

Now, for each $w \in \Lambda$ and for each nn_0-preimage $w(-nn_0) \in \Lambda$ of w, we have that $f^{jn_0}(w(-nn_0)) \in B_{n_0}(z_j, \varepsilon)$, for each $0 \leq j \leq n-1$. From this we deduce that $|Df^{nn_0}_s(w(-nn_0))| \geq \chi(n)$. Next observe that in general, given any full prehistory $\hat{w} = (w, w_{-1}, \dots) \in \hat{\Lambda}$ of some element $w \in \Lambda$, there exists $k(\hat{w}, n) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|Df^{k(\hat{w},n)n_0}_s(w_{-k(\hat{w},n)n_0})|$ is comparable to $\chi(n)$, that is,

$$C_0^{-1} \cdot \chi(n) < |Df^{k(\hat{w},n)n_0}_s(w_{-k(\hat{w},n)n_0})| < C_0 \cdot \chi(n),$$

where we have put $C_0 := \sup_{z\in\Lambda} \cdot |Df^{n_0}_s(z)|$. This shows that for $w \in W$ we have that the diameter $\operatorname{diam} U_{k(\hat{w},n)n_0}(w_{-k(\hat{w},n)n_0})$ is comparable to $\chi(n)$, where the comparability constant does depend neither on w nor on n. Hence, the sets $U_{k(\hat{w},n)n_0}(w_{-k(\hat{w},n)n_0})$ provide a covering of W and their diameters are all of size comparable to $\chi(n)$. For later use, let us remark that one can choose a point $z_{k(\hat{w},n)}(\hat{w}) \in E_{n_0}$ such that $w_{-n_0 k(\hat{w},n)} \in B_{n_0}(z_{k(\hat{w},n)}(\hat{w}), \varepsilon)$ and similarly, points $z_{k(\hat{w},n)-j}(\hat{w}) \in E_{n_0}$ such that $f^{n_0 j}(w_{-n_0 k(\hat{w},n)}) \in B_{n_0}(z_{k(\hat{w},n)-j}(\hat{w}), \varepsilon)$, for each $1 \leq j < k(\hat{w}, n)$. Then recalling that $E_{n_0} =: \{e_1, \dots, e_{m_0}\}$, the inequality in (7) reads:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m_0} \frac{\delta_i^t}{\omega(f(e_i))\dots\omega(f^{n_0}(e_i))} < \frac{1}{2}.$$

By raising both sides of this inequality to the power $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and then summing over p, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}(8)\qquad &\sum_{p\in\mathbb{N}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m_0}\frac{\delta_i^t}{\omega(f(e_i))\dots\omega(f^{n_0}(e_i))}\right)^p = \\ &= \sum_{p\in\mathbb{N}}\sum_{(i_1,\dots,i_p)\in\{1,\dots,m_0\}^p}\frac{\delta_{i_1}^t\dots\delta_{i_p}^t}{\big(\omega(f(e_{i_1}))\dots\omega(f^{n_0}(e_{i_1}))\big)\cdot\dots\cdot\big(\omega(f(e_{i_p}))\dots\omega(f^{n_0}(e_{i_p}))\big)} < 1.\end{aligned}$$

Let us now again consider some point $w \in \Lambda$ and its full prehistory $\hat{w} = (w, w_{-1}, \dots) \in \hat{\Lambda}$. By the above, we then have that the orbit of $w_{-k(\hat{w},n)n_0}$ under the map $f^{k(\hat{w},n)n_0}$ is shadowed by the consecutive linking of the n_0-orbits of $k(\hat{w}, n)$ points from E_{n_0}. Then, the summand of the corresponding sum, associated with this orbit, is of the form

$$(9)\qquad \frac{\big(\operatorname{diam} U_{k(\hat{w},n)n_0}(w_{-k(\hat{w},n)n_0})\big)^t}{\big(\omega(z_{k(\hat{w},n)}(\hat{w}))\dots\omega(f^{n_0}(z_{k(\hat{w},n)}(\hat{w})))\big)\dots(\omega(z_1(\hat{w}))\dots\omega(f^{n_0}(z_1(\hat{w}))))}.$$

We can now use the procedure of successive partial minimisation and elimination, which we used in the proof of Theorem 1, and this then leads to a covering of $W_r^s(x) \cap \Lambda$ consisting of sets of diameter comparable to $\chi(n)$. Indeed, as in the proof of Theorem 1, here we use the fact that the denominators of the terms in (8) are products of evaluations of ω along the forward orbit of the preimages. In this way we obtain a sum with summands of the form as in (9), which is smaller or equal than the sum in (8). To this sum we can apply the repeated partial minimisation procedure as in the proof of Theorem 1, in order to extract a subcover $\mathcal{V}$ such that in the associated sum the denominators are successively eliminated, that is, we arrive at the inequality

$$\sum_{U\in\mathcal{V}}(\operatorname{diam} U)^t < 1.$$

From this it clearly follows that

$$\beta^s(y) \le t_\omega, \text{ for all } y \in W_r^s(x) \cap \Lambda.$$

(b) The aim is to show that the stable upper box-counting dimension β^s is constant on Λ. For this note that, since f is transitive on Λ, there exists a point $x \in \Lambda$ whose set of preimages is dense in Λ. Therefore, if $y \in \Lambda$ is some fixed arbitrary point and if $\varepsilon > 0$, then there exists some n-preimage x_{-n} of x such that $d(x_{-n}, y) = \varepsilon$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Then notice that the local product structure (see [7]) implies that if for some $z \in \Lambda$ the local unstable manifold $W_r^u(\hat{z})$ intersects $W_r^s(y)$, then it will intersect $W_r^s(x_{-n})$ at a unique point contained in Λ. Likewise, any local unstable manifold which intersects $W_r^s(x_{-n})$ will also intersect $W_r^s(y)$ in a point from Λ. Note that if $W_r^s(y) \cap \Lambda$ is covered by balls $U \in \mathcal{U}$ of radius $\varepsilon > 0$, then the set $W_r^s(x_{-n}) \cap \Lambda$ is covered by the same number of balls of radius at most $C'\varepsilon$, for some fixed constant $C' > 0$. This follows, since the intersection $W_r^s(x_{-n}) \cap \bigcup_{\hat{z}\in\hat{\Lambda}, z\in U} W_r^u(\hat{z})$ is contained in a ball of radius $C'\varepsilon$, which follows since $d(x_{-n}, y) = \varepsilon$ and since the inclination of local unstable manifolds with respect to $W_r^s(y)$ is bounded from below, a consequence of the uniform hyperbolicity of f on Λ.

Also, if we cover $W_r^s(x_{-n}) \cap \Lambda$ with balls of radius ε, then we can consider all local unstable manifolds through the points of each of these balls to obtain balls of radius at most $C'\varepsilon$ which are contained in these balls in $W_r^s(y)$. However, by setting $\varepsilon' := \varepsilon|Df_s(x_{-n})|^n$ for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, we have that every covering by balls of radius ε' of $W_r^s(x) \cap \Lambda$ gives a covering by balls of radius ε of $W_r^s(x) \cap \Lambda$. Therefore

$$\beta^s(y) = \beta^s(x), \text{ for all } y \in \Lambda$$

and therefore, it follows that the stable upper box dimension is constant throughout Λ. □

Remark. Let us assume for a moment that the following condition is satisfied: if D is the maximum possible value of Δ on Λ, then for each $1 \leq i \leq D-1$ the sets $\Lambda_i := \{x \in \Lambda : \Delta(x) \leq i\}$ have their respective closure contained in Λ_{i+1}. Note that, by the upper semi-continuity of Δ on Λ, we have that the set $\Lambda_D := \{x \in \Lambda : \Delta(x) = D\}$ is closed in Λ. Also, the upper semi-continuity of Δ implies that Λ_i is open in Λ, for each $1 \leq i \leq D-2$. Due to our assumption here, it is possible to fix some neighbourhood $\Lambda_i(\varepsilon)$ of $\bar{\Lambda}_i$ such that $\Lambda_i(\varepsilon) \subset \Lambda_{i+1}$, for each $1 \leq i \leq D-2$. Also, let us fix some neighbourhood $\Lambda_{D-1}(\varepsilon)$ of the closure of Λ_{D-1}. Then define $K_0 := \Lambda_D \setminus \Lambda_{D-1}(\varepsilon)$, $K_1 := \bar{\Lambda}_{D-1} \setminus \Lambda_{D-2}(\varepsilon), K_2 := \bar{\Lambda}_{D-2} \setminus \Lambda_{D-3}(\varepsilon), \ldots, K_{D-1} := \bar{\Lambda}_1$ and note that the family $\{K_j : 0 \leq j < D\}$ consists of pairwise disjoint compact sets. Therefore, there exists a continuous function ψ on Λ such that $\psi(x) = D$ for all $x \in K_0$, $D-1 \leq \psi(x) \leq D$ for $x \in \Lambda_{D-1}(\varepsilon) \setminus \bar{\Lambda}_{D-1}$, $\psi(x) = D-1$ for $x \in K_1$, and $D-2 \leq \psi(x) \leq D-1$ for $x \in \Lambda_{D-2}(\varepsilon) \setminus \bar{\Lambda}_{D-2}$, which can be continued until we reach Λ_1. By construction, we then have that $\Delta(x) \geq \psi(x)$, for all $x \in \Lambda$. By applying Theorem 1, it follows that $\delta^s(x) \leq t_{\psi_\varepsilon}$, for all $x \in \Lambda$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Also, by choosing $\varepsilon \geq \varepsilon'$ appropriately, we can assume that $\Lambda_i(\varepsilon') \subset \Lambda_i(\varepsilon)$. Therefore, we have for each $x \in \Lambda$ that $\psi_\varepsilon(x)$ is increasing, for ε tending to zero. This implies that there exists t_* such that t_{ψ_ε} tends to t_*, for ε tending to zero, and therefore, we have that $\delta^s(x) \leq t_*$, for each $x \in \Lambda$.

4. Two examples

Example 1. We assume that the reader is familiar with the type of horseshoes introduced by Simon and Solomyak in [22]. They considered horseshoes with overlaps in $\mathbb{R}^3$ which are given by a $\mathcal{C}^{1+\epsilon}$-transformation f, defined by

$$f(x,y,z) := (\gamma(x,z), \eta(y,z), \psi(z)), \text{ for all } (x,y,z) \in [0,1] \times [0,1] \times \mathcal{I},$$

where $\mathcal{I} := \bigcup_{i=1}^m \in I_i$ denotes the union of m compact pairwise disjoint intervals $I_1, \ldots, I_m \subset (0,1)$; we also assume that $m \geq 3$, that $\lambda_1 < |\gamma'_x|, |\eta'_y| < \lambda_2$ for some $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < 1/2$, that $|\psi'| > 1$ on $\mathcal{I}$, and that $\psi(I_i) = [0,1]$, for all $i = 1, \ldots, m$. The basic set Λ of f is defined as before, that is, $\Lambda := \cap_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} f^n([0,1]^3)$. Let us now consider the following perturbations f_τ of f:

$$f_\tau(x,y,z) := (\gamma(x,z) + \tau_{i,1}, \eta(y,z) + \tau_{i,2}, \psi(z)), \text{ for all } (x,y,z) \in [0,1] \times [0,1] \times I_i, 1 \leq i \leq m. \tag{10}$$

We will say that $\tau := (\tau_{1,1}, \tau_{1,2}, \ldots, \tau_{m,1}, \tau_{m,2})$ is *f-admissible* if $f_\tau(\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq m} [0,1]^2 \times I_i) \subset (0,1)^2 \times [0,1]$. It can be checked that the set of f-admissible parameters τ is a non-empty open subset of $\mathbb{R}^{2m}$. Also, due to the expansion in the z-direction as well as the contractions with respect to the (x,y)-coordinates, one can show that f_τ is hyperbolic on the basic set Λ_τ associated with f_τ.

As in [22], one then verifies that for Lebesgue almost every f-admissible τ we have that the stable dimension of Λ_τ is given by the maximum of the zeros s_1, and s_2 respectively, of certain pressure functions of $\log|\gamma'_x|$, and $\log|\eta'_y|$ respectively, on the symbolic space Σ_m. Let us now assume that on $[0,1] \times \mathcal{I}$ we have

$$|\gamma'_x| = |\eta'_y| \equiv 1/m$$

Then from the proof of Theorem 1 *i)* of [22] and the fact that in this case both zeros s_1 and s_2 are equal to 1, it follows that the stable dimension of Λ_τ is equal to 1, for Lebesgue-almost every f-admissible τ.

However, in the above case we have that the zero $t_{1,\tau}$ of the pressure function $t \mapsto P_{f_\tau|_{\Lambda_\tau}}(t\Phi^s_\tau)$ for the stable potential function Φ^s_τ, is also equal to 1. This follows, since $\Phi^s_\tau \equiv -\log m$ and since the entropy of $f_\tau|_{\Lambda_\tau}$ is equal to $\log m$, where the latter is due to the fact that the spanning sets of $f|_{\Lambda_\tau}$ are determined only by the dynamics of ψ in the z coordinate; but this dynamics in the z-direction is conjugated to the shift σ_m on Σ_m, since ψ expands I_i onto the whole interval $[0,1]$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, m$. This shows that $t_{1,\tau} = 1$. Also note that if $|\gamma'_x| = |\eta'_y| \equiv 1/m$ on $[0,1] \times \mathcal{I}$, then f_τ is c-conformal. Therefore, since $\delta^s = t_{1,\tau}$, we can

now apply Corollary 1, which then gives that almost every horseshoe f_τ has an open dense set of points in its associated basic set Λ_τ such that each of these points has precisely one f_τ-preimage in Λ_τ.

In conclusion, for the above choice of γ, η, we have now shown that Lebesgue-almost every translation f_τ is close to being a homeomorphism on its associated basic set Λ_τ. We summarise this result in the following:

Corollary 3. *Let $(f_\tau)_\tau$ denote the family of horsehoes with overlaps given in (10), and assume that on $[0,1] \times \mathcal{I}$ we have $|\gamma'_x| = |\eta'_y| \equiv 1/m$. Also, let $\Lambda_\tau := \cap_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f_\tau^n([0,1]^3)$ denote the associated basic set of f_τ. Then, for Lebesgue-almost every f-admissible parameter τ there exists an open dense set A_τ in Λ_τ, such that every $x \in A_\tau$ has precisely one f_τ-preimage in Λ_τ.*

Example 2. In [10] the first author gave an example of a family of non-linear hyperbolic skew products for which the preimage counting function is not constant on their associated basic sets. Let us first briefly recall the construction of this family. For $\alpha \in (0,1)$, let $I_1^\alpha, I_2^\alpha \subset I := [0,1]$ be two intervals such that $I_1^\alpha \subset [\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon(\alpha), \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon(\alpha)]$ and $I_2^\alpha \subset [1-\alpha-\epsilon(\alpha), 1-\alpha+\epsilon(\alpha)]$, for some $0 < \epsilon(\alpha) < \alpha^2$ sufficiently small. Let $g : I_1^\alpha \cup I_2^\alpha \to I$ be a strictly increasing smooth function with the property that $g(I_1^\alpha) = g(I_2^\alpha) = I$. Also, assume that there exists a large number $\beta > 0$ such that $\beta^2 > g'(x) > \beta$, for each $x \in I_1^\alpha \cup I_2^\alpha$. Then there exist intervals $I_{11}^\alpha, I_{12}^\alpha \subset I_1^\alpha$ and $I_{21}^\alpha, I_{22}^\alpha \subset I_2^\alpha$ such that $g(I_{11}^\alpha) = g(I_{21}^\alpha) = I_1^\alpha$ and $g(I_{12}^\alpha) = g(I_{22}^\alpha) = I_2^\alpha$. For $J^\alpha := I_{11}^\alpha \cup I_{12}^\alpha \cup I_{21}^\alpha \cup I_{22}^\alpha$ and $J_*^\alpha := \{x \in J^\alpha : g^i(x) \in J^\alpha \text{ for all } i \geq 0\}$, we then let $f_\alpha : J_*^\alpha \times I \to J_*^\alpha \times I$ be defined by

$$f_\alpha(x,y) := (g(x), h_\alpha(x,y)), \text{ where } h_\alpha(x,y) := \begin{cases} \psi_{1,\alpha}(x) + s_{1,\alpha} y, & x \in I_{11}^\alpha \\ \psi_{2,\alpha}(x) + s_{2,\alpha} y, & x \in I_{21}^\alpha \\ \psi_{3,\alpha}(x) - s_{3,\alpha} y, & x \in I_{12}^\alpha \\ s_{4,\alpha} y, & x \in I_{22}^\alpha, \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

where $s_{1,\alpha}, ..., s_{4,\alpha} \in (1/2 - \varepsilon_0, 1/2 + \varepsilon_0)$ denote some arbitrary fixed numbers close to $1/2$ and $\psi_{1,\alpha}, \psi_{2,\alpha}, \psi_{3,\alpha} : I \to \mathbb{R}$ are $\mathcal{C}^2$-functions which are ε_0-close (with respect to the $\mathcal{C}^1$-metric) to the linear functions given by $x \mapsto x$, $x \mapsto 1 - x$ and $x \mapsto 1$ respectively. Let us also use the following shorter notation:

$$h_{x,\alpha}(y) := h_\alpha(x,y), \text{for any } (x,y) \text{ for which this is well-defined.}$$

By defining $h_{z,\alpha}^n := h_{f^n(z),\alpha} \circ \ldots \circ h_{z,\alpha}$ for each $n \geq 0$, the basic set Λ_α of the above system is given by

$$\Lambda_\alpha = \bigcup_{x \in J_*^\alpha} \bigcap_{n \geq 0} \bigcup_{z \in g^{-n}(x) \cap J_*^\alpha} h_{z,\alpha}^n(I).$$

In [10] it was shown that for α small enough, the map f_α is a hyperbolic endomorphism on Λ_α and that there exist two infinite point sets $A_\alpha, B_\alpha \subset \Lambda_\alpha$, which are both not dense in Λ_α, such that for each point in A_α the preimage counting function Δ is constant equal to 1, whereas for points in B_α we have that Δ is constant equal to 2. Since Δ is upper semi-continuous, it follows that A_α is open in Λ_α and that B_α is closed in Λ_α. We want now to obtain an estimate on δ^s by using Theorem 1. There exists a non-constant continuous function ω such that $1 \leq \omega(x) \leq 2$ for all $x \in \Lambda_\alpha$, and $\omega(x) = 1$ for all $x \in A_\alpha$. Hence we have $\omega(x) \leq \Delta(x), x \in \Lambda_\alpha$. The function ω may be viewed as an "approximation" of the function $\chi_{B_\alpha} + 1$. Then an application of Theorem 1 gives the following estimate:

$$\delta^s(y) \leq t_\omega, \text{ for all } \ y \in \Lambda_\alpha$$

Similarly as before consider an increasing sequence of non-constant continuous functions ω_m such that $\omega_m \equiv 1$ on A_α, and $1 \leq \omega_m \leq 2$ on Λ_α. For each member of this sequence we can now argue as before. This leads to

improvements of the upper bounds for $\delta^s(y)$. Namely, with t_{ω_m} referring to the zero of the pressure function associated with ω_m, we have that t_{ω_m} are decreasing when $m \to \infty$ and

$$\delta^s(y) \leq t_{\omega_m}, \text{ for all } y \in \Lambda_\alpha, m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

In particular, by applying Proposition 2, we obtain that the stable upper box dimension β^s is constant on Λ_α and bounded above by t_{ω_m}, for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

□

Acknowledgements:

References

[1] L. Barreira, *Dimension and recurrence in hyperbolic dynamics*, Progress in Mathematics vol. 272, Birkhauser, 2008.

[2] H. G. Bothe, Shift spaces and attractors in noninvertible horseshoes, Fund. Math. **152**, 1997, 267-289.

[3] R. Bowen, *Equilibrium states and the ergodic theory of Anosov diffeomorphisms*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 470, Springer 1975.

[4] R. Bowen, Hausdorff dimension of quasicircles, Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Etudes Sci. **50**, 1979, 11-25.

[5] G. Edgar, Fractal dimension of self-similar sets: some examples, Suppl. Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo Ser. II, **28**, 1992, 341-358.

[6] K. Falconer, The Hausdorff dimension of some fractals and attractors of overlapping construction, J. Stat. Phys. **47**, 1987, 123-132.

[7] A. Katok and B. Hasselblatt, *Introduction to the Modern Theory of Dynamical Systems*, Cambridge Univ. Press, London-New York, 1995.

[8] A. Manning and H. McCluskey, Hausdorff dimension for horseshoes, Ergodic Th. and Dynam. Systems **3**, 1983, 251-260.

[9] P. Mattila, *Geometry of sets and measures in euclidean spaces. Fractals and Rectifiability*, Cambridge University Press, 1995.

[10] E. Mihailescu, Unstable directions and fractal dimensions for a family of skew products with overlaps, Math. Zeitschrift, **269**, 2011, 733-750.

[11] E. Mihailescu, Unstable manifolds and Holder structures associated with noninvertible maps, Discrete and Cont. Dynam. Syst. **14**, 3, 2006, 419-446.

[12] E. Mihailescu and M. Urbański, Relations between stable dimension and the preimage counting function on basic sets with overlaps, Bull. London Math. Soc. **42**, 2010, 15-27.

[13] Y. Peres and B. Solomyak, Problems on self-similar sets and self-affine sets: an update, Progress in Probability **46**, 2000, 95-106.

[14] Y. Pesin, *Dimension theory in dynamical systems*, Chicago Lectures in Math. Series, 1997.

[15] F. Przytycki, Anosov endomorphisms, Studia Mathematica **58**, 1976, 249-285.

[16] F. Przytycki and M. Urbański, On Hausdorff dimension of some fractal sets, Studia Math. **93**, 1989, 155-186.

[17] D. Ruelle, *Elements of differentiable dynamics and bifurcation theory*, Academic Press, New York, 1989.

[18] D. Ruelle, *Thermodynamic formalism*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1978.

[19] D. Ruelle, Repellers for real analytic maps, Ergodic Th. and Dynam. Systems **2**, 1982, 99-107.

[20] A. Schief, Separation properties for self-similar sets, Proceed. Amer. Math. Soc., **122**, 1994, 111-115.

[21] K. Simon, Hausdorff dimension for non-invertible maps, Ergodic Th. and Dynam. Syst. **13**, 1993, 199-212.

[22] K. Simon and B. Solomyak, Hausdorff dimension for horseshoes in $\mathbb{R}^3$, Ergod. Th. and Dynam. Syst., **19**, 1999, 1343-1363.

[23] B. Solomyak, Measure and dimension for some fractal families, Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. **124**, 1998, 531-546.

Eugen Mihailescu, Eugen.Mihailescu@imar.ro
Institute of Mathematics of the Romanian Academy, P. O. Box 1-764, RO 014700,
Bucharest, Romania.

Bernd Stratmann, bos@math.uni-bremen.de
Fachbereich 3 - Mathematik, Universität Bremen,
Bremen, Germany.